

Remarks

The Office Action acknowledges Applicants' election with traverse of Group I (Claims 1-10). However, the Office Action states that the restriction requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made final. Thus, the Office Action states that Claims 11 and 12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group II. Accordingly, in view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Claims 11-12 have been withdrawn. Applicants retain the right to present Claims 11-12 in a divisional application.

Further, in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, a title "A Method of Manufacturing A Folding Top For A Convertible" has been suggested. Since Applicants have withdrawn Claims 11 and 12 directed towards a method for reworking a connector attached to an electronic board, Applicants believe that the original title "A Tool For Reworking A Press-Fit Connector" is still appropriate and, thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

Referring to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that the term "adapted for" in Claim 1, line 5, performs a function that is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform and that it does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 has been amended so as to distinctly and particularly point out the structural attributes of the present invention. Further, Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled, since they have been incorporated into the amended Claim 1. Also, Claim 5 has been amended to be dependent on the amended Claim 1, and Claim 10 has been amended to reflect a minor correction. Claim 2 and Claims 6-10 are dependent on the amended Claim 1 and its dependents, thus, allowable. Therefore, Applicants'

respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-2 and Claims 5-10 under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Referring to paragraph 6 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al U. S. Patent No. 6,138,345 (hereinafter referred to as “Suzuki” or “the Suzuki patent”). Further, paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that Claims 7-10 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Suzuki patent in view of Ota et al U. S. Patent No. 5,509,192 (hereinafter referred to as “Ota” or “the Ota patent”). However, paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that “claims 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.”

In accordance with paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Applicants have amended the base Claim 1 so that it includes intervening Claim 3 and allowable Claim 4. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled, since they are now incorporated into the amended Claim 1. Claim 5 has been amended to change its dependence to amended Claim 1 and Claim 10 has been amended to reflect a minor correction. As such, Claim 2 and Claims 6-10 in the application are dependent on amended Claim 1 and its dependents, thus, Applicants believe that the present Claims 1-2 and Claims 5-10 are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicants have added a new Claim 13, which claims a tool for reworking a connector attached to an electronic board in accordance with the invention. The tool comprises a holding structure for holding the electronic board, a jaw for receiving a selected module to be removed from the electronic board, and a movement structure for moving the jaw relative to the holding structure, as shown in Figs. 2a and 2b. Further, the jaw includes a wedge and a slit, with the slit receiving the selected module, and with the wedge separating the selected module from any adjacent modules (as shown in Fig. 4), so that the selected module can be removed from the

connector without damage to any adjacent modules. Applicants submit that the claims in the application, as amended, are not obvious in light of the separate teachings of Suzuki and Ota nor the combined teachings of Suzuki and Ota. Thus, Applicants' submit that the present Claims 1-2, 5-10 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art references (Suzuki and Ota) and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and allowance of the present claims in this case are respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,



Silvy Anna Murphy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,959
100 Turnberry Lane
Cary, North Carolina 27511
Phone: 919-859-2360
Fax: 919-859-2370

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed is being deposited on the date indicated below with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, with sufficient postage as first class mail (37 CFR 1.8 (a)).


(Signature of person mailing paper)

3-23-04

Date